THE FINNISH *MINULLA ON,* LATIN *HABEO,* GERMAN *ICH HABE*

Pentti Aalto (†)

1. *MINULLA ON*

The legendary Finnish syntax by Emil Nestor Setälä (1864-1935) was originally published in 1880, when its author was only 16 years old, and was then reissued in several editions. In its 11th edition (1926) Setälä appended to §60 II a note treating the *minulla on* construction. In this note the author states:

> This construction is used to express the same relation which in other languages is expressed with a special transitive verb (Latin *habere*, French *avoir*, German *haben*, Swedish *hava*). The expression is so far formulary that the verb always stands in third person singularis though its subject may stand in plural. In literature we can see instances gone farther: in imitation of foreign languages the construction *minulla on* has been understood as a transitive verb and given a direct object, e.g. *minulla ei ole hätää, niin kauan kuin minulla on sinut* ('I will be in no distress as long as I will have thee'). Such a purely literary manner of expression is to be branded as an outrageous linguistic error that must absolutely be avoided.

Setälä also proposed two ways to replace this expression (both in my opinion inferior to it). The Finnish grammarians seem to have now changed their opinion and accepted this construction, e.g. in the 1992 translation of Psalms 73,25 "*Taivaassa minulla on sinut*" rendering the 1933 version's "*ketä muuta minulla olisi taivaassa!*" which seems to be based on LXX 72,25 (= Masor. 73,25) and Vulg. *quid enim mihi est in coelo.*

The lectures on modern linguistics at the University of Helsinki in the spring of 1963 by Erkki Itkonen (1913-1992) were later published as a book *Kieli ja sen tutkimus* (Itkonen 1966). This has been praised by the critics for its clarity. The author states:

> The verb 'to own' that is met with in most Indo-European languages (Lat. *habere*, German *haben*, etc.), is rare in the Finno-Ugric languages. The Latin expression *vir filium habet* has a counterpart only in some Sweden-Lappish dialects and in the Ob-Ugrian languages. The expression in question seems in Lappish to be depending on Scandinavian influence. The verb *âdnet* 'to hold, to use' has been adapted to the function of the verb 'to have'. The Finnish expression *miehellä on poika* represents a com-

mon FU usage, according to which the word meaning the thing owned is the subject of the clause and the predicate is a form of the verb 'to be', while the owner is only a qualifier. In Finnish it is an adverbial, but in other languages it can be a predicate complement or an attribute to the word expressing the owned. (Itkonen 1966: 309.)

Having then given some examples of these expressions in other FU languages, Itkonen continues:

> A nominal statement is also used in Russian, in which the expression is strikingly of the FU type; the owner is expressed with a prepositional construction *u* 'near, beside' + a genitive: *u nego kniga* 'he has a book' (Itkonen 1966: 309).

Lauri Hakulinen (1899-1985) in his work *Suomen kielen rakenne ja kehitys* mentions among the meanings expressed with the adessive, the possessive one *minulla on rahaa* 'I have money', as "the syntactic construction mending the lack of the auxiliary *avoir*, so characteristic of our language" (Hakulinen 1968: 90, §48F) In the footnote 128a Hakulinen further remarks, that the lack of an auxiliary of the *avoir* type is peculiar to the FU languages, as Martin Fogel already pointed out in 1669. According to Hakulinen (1968: 391, n. 1031), the Finnish special verb *omistaa* 'to possess, to own', is met with in this significance as late as in 1826, and is a loan translation. Interestingly enough it seems to have a close parallel in Anglo-Saxon *āgnian* 'to own, to confess', from *āgen*.

Finnish *minulla on* contains the sg. 3rd person of the verb *olla* 'to be'. Only this person with its exceptional form has been explained as being of another origin than the other paradigm *ole-*, viz. as a rest of *omi~oma* 'own'. There had thus been a purely nominal clause *miehellä oma~i poika* 'to the man an own son' (but also this etymology might imply a verb *o-*, cf. SKES, II: 429; SSA, II: 264).

The situation in the Indo-European languages is, however, remarkably more complicated than Setälä, Itkonen and Hakulinen lead us to understand. Firstly, it must be stated that Latin *habere* is not etymologically connected with German *haben*. In the opinion of most scholars the Germanic verb is related to Latin *capio* 'I take', and to Albanian *kam* 'I have' (aor. *patse*), both from a root **qap-*, Pisani (1947, Nr. 89) derives both *habere* and *haben* from a root **khabh-e-*; however, according to Walde (1910), IE **qhabhe-* would have given Latin **cabe-* and not *habe-*. Walde and most other scholars, therefore suggest different roots for these verbs. F. Holthausen (1934: 40) seems to be uncertain: Goth. *haban* is either a loan from Latin *habere* "oder zu *hafjan*?". Later, in his *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der englischen Sprache*, he combined them both: "ae. *hafjan*, *habban*, go. *haben* < L. *habere*" (Holthausen 1949: 94b). Historical reasons in any case seem to preclude us from deriving the Latin verb from Germanic.

According to Meillet, in IE the concept of 'owning' was originally not expressed as a process with a special verb but as a fact with a nominal sentence. This seems to be very much like the Finnish construction, viz. made with a dative of the

person and the verb 'to be', the subject of which expresses the thing possessed. This is clearly reflected in our earliest sources, e.g. in Sanskrit, Rig Veda VI 24,8: *gambhīre cid bhavati gādham asmai* 'even in deep water he has a ford' (< "there is a ford to him"), Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa X 4,3,9 *ko mahyaṁ bhāgo bhaviṣyati* 'what part will be to me?'; in Hittite *tuqqa* UL *kuitki esži* "to thee nothing is" > 'thou dost not have anything' (Benveniste 1949: 44). In New Indo-Aryan the same construction is still being used. Sampson (1926, §443) shows that it is still met with in the European dialects of the Romany language, e.g. *sas ī kandā t'a kek dandā* 'it has ears but no teeth' (further instances in §§445-446, §473, and in the Vocabulary, p. 119a). Only Rumanian and Greek dialects have replaced it with a construction using the verb *ter-* 'to hold, to grasp', from Sanskrit *dhar-*, cf. below.

In the oldest Iranian source, the Avesta, e.g. Yast 10,2: *uvayā̊ zī asti miθro drvataēča asaonaēča* 'to both there is a covenant, to the unbeliever and to the believing'. In Middle Iranian, according to Nyberg (1974: 51b; *būtan* 'to be'), "In the 3rd p., together with a subst., virtually in dat., or with a pron. in cas. obl., it expresses the notion 'to have'": e.g. *Pāpak rād hēč fradand nē būt* 'to Papak there was no child'; *duxtar i varzēkarān ēn hunar ...i tō hast nē bavēt* 'a farmer's daughter cannot have such an ability as thou hast'; Xusraw u rētak 5: *mād kē man pus būt hom bē ēnīh an pus nē būt* 'to the mother whose son I was, except me other son not was'; Ayatkār i Žāmāspīk IV 33: *čē šmāx apāk dēvān čiš-č kār n-ēst* 'for to you there is not anything to do with the devs'; IX 9: *u-šān mas sardār n-ēst* 'and to them any chief not is'; XIV 5: *u-tān zamān nē bavēt* 'and for you time not will be'.

In Greek the corresponding construction is met with in the earliest times, e.g. Iliad 5,248: μήτηρ δέ οἵ ἐστ' Ἀφροδίτη 'mother to him is A.'; 9,144: τρεῖς δὲ μοί εἰσι θύγατρες 'three daughters have I'; 23,173: ἐννέα τῷ γε ἄνακτι τραπεζῆες κύνες ἦσαν 'nine dogs had the prince, that fed beneath his table'; 23,549: ἔστι τοι ἐν κλισίῃ χρυσὸς πολύς, ἔστι δε χαλκός, καὶ πρόβατ', εἰσι δέ τοι δμωαί καὶ μώνυχες ἵπποι 'thou hast in thy hut a great store of gold, hast bronze, and sheep and handmaids too and single-hoofed horses'.

D. I. Edelman wrote in *Mélanges E. Benveniste* about this construction in the Iranic languages (Edelman 1975). In the Old Persian inscription of Bisutun it is said IV,56: *taiy taumā vasiy bīyā* 'may there be a great descendance to thee' (*bīyā* is aor. optat. sg. 3rd p. of the verb *bū-* 'to be'). In the Avesta Yasna 29,1: *nōiṯ mōi vāstā xšmaṯ anyo* '(there is) to me no shepherd other than you'. In the same way 'to have' is expressed today in Šughnī, spoken in Pamir: *δu-aray vazēn-en māš-and yast* 'there is to us two-three goats', and in Rōšānī: *mun-ā kurta yašt* 'to me one shirt is there'. In Yazgulamī: *dow bon čiray-əf yast* 'there is to you two apricot trees'. In the Tajīkī of Samarkand it is said: *man-ba kitob hast* 'to me there is a book'.

In spite of the development of the verb ἐχ- (< *segh-*), originally 'to keep', 'to hold', to the meaning 'to have' this ancient turn of phrase still is met with in Biblical Greek, too, e.g. Luke 1,7: οὐκ ἦν αὐτοῖς τέκνον, Vulg. *non erat illis filius,*

Wulf. *ni was im barne*, Church-Sl. *ne bě ima čęda*, Arm. *oč̣ goyr noc̣a ordeak*, Fi. *heillä ei ollut lasta*; 9,13: οὐκ εἰσὶν ἡμῖν πλεῖον ἢ ἄρτοι πέντε, Vulg. *non sunt nobis plus quam quinque panes*, Wulf. *nist hindar uns maizo fimf hlaiban*, Fi. *meillä ei ole enempää kuin viisi leipää*. Paul. Rom. 9,2: λύπη μοί ἐστιν μεγάλη, Vulg. *tristitia mihi magna est*, Wulf. *saurga mis ist mikila*, Fi. *minulla on suuri murhe*. Gen. 13,5: Λωτ ...ἦν πρόβατα καὶ βοές καὶ σκήναι, Vulg. *Lot ...fuerunt greges ovium, et armenta, et tabernacula*, Arm. *Lovteay ēr arjāṙ ew oč̣xar ew anasum*, Fi. *Lotilla ...oli pikkukarjaa, raavaskarjaa, ja telttoja* (also in Hebrew *le Lot ...haja*). Luke 12,24: ...οἷς οὐκ ἔστιν ταμιεῖον οὐδὲ ἀποθήκη, Vulg. *quibus non est cellarium neque horreum*, Ch.-Sl. *imŭže něstŭ sŭkrovišta ni xranilišta*, Fi. *eikä niillä ole säilytyshuonetta eikä aittaa* (1992 transl. "...*vajaa eikä varastoa*").

In Latin that which someone was said to have, was in the beginning almost exclusively concrete, e.g. Plautus, Stichus 259: *nulla-n tibi lingua est?* 'dost thou not have a tongue?', but Pseudolus 1250: *magnum hoc vitium vino-st* 'the wine has this great blame'. Sallustius, Catilina 37: *semper in civitate quibus opes nullae sunt, bonis invident*, 'always in a community those who have no means envy the good'. In Umbrian, an Italic language closely related to Latin, we find a similar construction, e.g. in the inscriptions of Iguvium V B 3: *panta muta aṙferture si* 'how great the fine is to the *adfertor*'.

This type of expression remained alive even in Romance languages, e.g. OF Chanson de Roland 1123: *elle (espede) fut a noble vassal* 'this sword was to a noble vassal'. According to Benveniste (1960: 123) in French *être à* demands a definite subject, it is, e.g,. impossible to say **un livre est à moi, ce livre* being the only possibility. In his opinion, therefore, the Latin construction *est mihi* corresponds to French *j'ai*, and not *est à moi*. From Rumanian Löfstedt (1963: 64ff.) quotes instances such as *îmi este frica* 'I have fear', *tatalui este foame* 'father has hunger'.

In the Celtic languages, which in many respects have developed in their own direction, it is difficult to say whether the corresponding constructions go back to a dative or to a genitive. Benveniste regards in Old Irish *ni-t-ta* 'thou dost not have', the *-t-* as the rest of the dative of 'thou'. In the Tripartite Life of St. Patrick (Ériu 6, p. 85) 82,15: *com-t-is secht maic lea di ingin* 'so-that-to-him-there-is seven sons and two daughters'. Buck (1949, 11.11, p. 740) shows how the Celtic languages translate even the Greek ἔχω with 'mihi est': John 4,17: οὐκ ἔχω ἄνδρα (Ch.-Sl. *jako mǫža ne imamŭ*, Fi. *ei minulla ole miestä*), Vulg. *non habeo virum*. New Irish *nī fhuil fear agam*, Welsh *nid ves gennyf wr*, Briton *nem eus pried ebet* 'there is not a husband to me'. These Celtic constructions were also noticed by J. Vendryes (1937): e.g. Welsh *un tat ae bu* 'one father to them was'. He also pointed out that in Irish a periphrastic perfect is formed with the aid of this construction: *tá caithte agam* "there is consumed to me" > 'I have consumed'; the

plusquamperfect is formed in the same way *bhíodh caithte agam* 'I had con-
sumed', etc. Suhonen (1993: 162) mentions from the North-Russian dialects a con-
struction which looks very similar: *u nas ezdeno na mel'nieju* 'with us (there is a)
departure~going to the mill' = 'we went~have gone to the mill' (it seems, however,
questionable, how far we here have to recognize an influence of the Finnish
construction, cf. below). Buck (1949: 741) states that this method of expressing
ownership is normal in the Indo-Iranian and Celtic languages, only in New Persian
is there in use the verb *dāstan* 'to have'. In Armenian, too, 'to be' + dative~geni-
tive is used to translate the special verb 'to have', e.g. *orum anun ēr* 'cui nomen
erat', John 16,21: ἡ γυνὴ ὅταν τίκτῃ, λύπην ἔχει, Vulg. *mulier cum parit, tristi-
tiam habet*, Wulf. *qin, þan bairiþ, saurga habaid*, Arm. *kin yoržam cnaniçi
trtmovt', ivn ē nma*, Fi. *kun vaimo synnyttää, on hänellä murhe*. Luke 3,11: ὁ
ἔχων δύο χιτῶνας, Vulg. *qui habet duas tunicas*, Wulf. *sa habands twos paidos*,
Arm. *oyr* (gen.) *içen erku handerk'*, Fi. *jolla on kaksi ihokasta*. Matt 13,5: ἔπεσεν
ἐπὶ τα πετρώδη ὅπου οὐκ εἶχεν γῆν ...διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν βάθοσ γῆς ...διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν
ῥίζαν, Vulg. *ceciderunt in petrosa ubi non habebant terram multam ...quia non
habebant altitudinem terrae ...quia non habebant radicem*, Arm. *yapaṙanzi ur
oč goyr hoł ...aṙ-ic-goy-ē hivt'oy erkri-n ...oč goyin armatk'*, Fi. *putosivat kallio-
perälle, jossa niillä ei ollut paljon maata... kun niillä ei ollut hyvää maata...
kun niillä ei ollut juuria*. John 9,41: ...οὐκ ἄν εἴχετε ἁμαρτίαν, Vulg. *non
haberetis peccatum*, Wulf. *ni þau habaidedeiþ fravaurhtais*, Ch.-Sl. *ne biste iměli
grěxa*, Arm. *oč ēr jer meł*, Fi. *teillä ei olisi syntiä*. Matt 8,20: ὁ δὲ υἱὸς τοῦ
ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἔχει ποῦ τὴν κεφαλὴν κλίνῃ, Vulg. *filius autem hominis non
habet ubi caput reclinet*, Wulf. *sunus mans ni habaiþ hvar haubiþ galagjai*, Ch.-
Sl. *synŭ člověčĭskŭ ne imatŭ kŭde glavŭ podŭkloniti*, Arm. *ordwoy mardoy oč goy
ur dicē z-glur iwr*, Fi. *Ihmisen Pojalla ei ole, mihin hän päänsä kallistaisi*. As
verbs in these constructions Armenian is using IE **es-*: *ē* 'is', *ēr* 'was', *içe* 'will
be', and IE **ues-*: *goy* 'is', *goyr* 'was'.

Similar constructions are met with outside the IE language, e.g. in Dravidian
Pengo: *ōḍatiŋ rinḍaŋ komoŋ* 'a goat has two horns' < "to a goat there are two
horns" (Burrow & Bhattacharya 1970, §73); 17,1: *taŋgeŋ himṇa gaṛce āvatat de*
'they had no son or daughter'; 18,5: *naŋgeŋ hārdi il hilet* 'I have no decent house'.
Also in Mandju: *inde jui akô ofi* 'since to him no son was'. From the Chagatay
Turkic Eckmann (1966: 282b) quotes instances of the same type: *maŋa bar~(erdi)*
"to me there is~was" = 'I have~had'. Fokos-Fuchs (1962: 78-79) wanted to regard
the Uralic and Altaic constructions as supporting the theory of the relationship
between these language families. He further quoted instances even from Mongolian,
e.g. *nadur morin bui* 'there is a horse to me', *nadur mönggün ügei bui* 'there is no
silver to me', *nada nom baina* 'there is a book to me', etc. Since, however, similar
constructions are used in other language families, too, they look somewhat doubtful
as proofs of a special UA relationship. For instance, in Tibetan this way of

expressing 'to have' is in use, e.g. Gser 'od (156,23) *de-la bu... gsum-žig yod* "to him three sons was". Mar-pa *khyod-la gser man-po yod-dam?* 'dost thou have much gold?' (Bacot 1948: 115).

2. *MINUN ON* AND *MINULLA ON*

However, there also exists in Finnish another way of expressing the same relationship, namely a genitive of the "possessor" + 'to be' + "the possessed thing": *pojan on nälkä* 'the boy has hunger'. When discussing this construction Itkonen (1966: 310) mentions that it is exclusively dominant in those FU languages which stand closest to Baltic Finnic. According to him, this construction thus might be the "original" one, though it now is being used more as a rudiment (mostly expressing an emotional or physical feeling). Hakulinen (1968) seems not to have treated this construction separately, but in §48C he shows that the genitive has been used early even as a dative.

In the IE languages, too, the corresponding expressions with a genitive seem to be at least of an equal age as those with the dative. E.g. Rig Veda VIII 45,33: *tava-id u tāḥ sukirtayo 'sann* 'thou may have those songs of praise'; VIII 2,7: *traya indrasya somāḥ sutāsaḥ santu devasya* 'three soma-drinks shall the god Indra have'. Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa I 1,4,14: *manor ha vā vṛṣabha āsa* 'Manu had a bull'. Aitareya Brāhmaṇa VII 13,1: *tasya śatam jāyā babhūvuḥ* 'he had a hundred wives'. Taittirīya Saṃhitā I 5,9,2: *ahar devānām āsīd rātrir asurāṇām* 'the devas had the day, the asuras the night'.

In the holy language of the Hinayana Buddhists, Pali, similar constructions are encountered. Furthermore, they are still closer to their Finnish counterparts, since in Pali the verb stands in sg. 3rd person independently of the number of the subject of the clause, e.g. in the Kuruṅgamiga-Jātaka (no. 206): *na sasassa tilā atthi na muggā nāpi taṇḍulā* 'a hare has no sesame-seeds, no mungo-beans, not even rice grains'. According to the Prakrit grammar of Pischel (1965, §515) the verb *as-* is the only one which has preserved its 3rd imperfect *asi*, used with all persons. We thus meet in Maharastri (Jacobi 1976, §100): *tassa... mahārāyaṇo cattāri mittā āsi* 'he had the four maharajas as friends'. In Iran we find in the Old Persian Bisutun Inscription I 12 Darius telling: *aitah xsaθram hacā paruviyatah asmāxam taumāyā āha* 'this kingdom ever since hoary antiquity was of our family'; I 10: *avahyā kambūjiyahyā brātā bardiyah nāman āha* 'that Kambyses had a brother Bardiya by name'. In the Avesta, e.g. Yasna 43,7: *kahya ahī* 'whose art thou'; Yast 6,2: *dāma ašava... yā̊ hənti spəntahe mainyōus* 'truthful creatures which are of the Holy Spirit'; Yast 19,56: *tat xvarənō... yaṯ asti airyanąm dahyunąm* 'this majesty which is of the Aryan countries', etc.

In Hittite the genitive was more often used than the dative in expressions of this kind. (Cf. Löfstedt 1963: l.c. who was relaying on A. Kammenhuber.) Benveniste stated in his paper "Sur l'emploi des cas en hittite" (1949: 44-45): "le hittite maintient deux importantes categoriés indo-européennes, le génitif, prédicat d'appartenance, mettant en relief la chose possédée, et le datif, prédicat de possession, faisant ressortir le possesseur". Is there a similar difference in Finnish between the expressions *minun on nälkä* and *minulla on nälkä*? (Cf., however, Ammann 1961: 73: "Man pflegt zu sagen, der Dat. possessoris betone den Besitz, der Gen. possessivus dagegen den Besitzer"). In Greek, e.g. Iliad 2,118: τοῦ γὰρ κράτος ἐστὶ μέγιστον 'his is the greatest power', etc. In the NT in some cases both the original and the translation language use this construction, e.g. Mark 10,14: τῶν γὰρ τοιούτων ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ, Vulg. *talium enim est regnum Dei*, Wulf. *þize ist þiuadangardi guþs*, Fi. *senkaltaisten on Jumalan valtakunta*. Matt 22,28: τίνος τῶν ἑπτὰ ἔσται γυνή, Vulg. *in resurrectione cujus erit de septem uxor*, Fi. *kenen vaimo noista seitsemästä hän siis ylösnousemuksessa on oleva?* Matt 5,3 = 10: ὅτι αὐτῶν ἐστιν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν, Vulg. *quoniam ipsorum est regnum coelorum*, Arm. *zi noça ē arkʻayutʻiwn erkniç*, Fi. *sillä heidän on taivasten valtakunta*.

The suggestion of Tamotsu Koizumi (1994: 333) that the FU construction with the genitive should be explained by Turkic influence looks in my opinion, in the light of the instances referred to above, superfluous. According to Fokos-Fuchs (1962: 78) the parallelism in question is to be regarded as a proof of the genetic affinity between the Uralic and the Altaic languages.

3. THE DEVELOPMENT OF *HABEO*

The Bengali linguist S. K. Chatterji published in his study *Languages and Literatures of Modern India* (1963: 70-92), specimens of the most remarkable languages. In order to make them more easily comparable he had collected translations of the Biblical tale of the Prodigal Son. In Classical Sanskrit this begins *kasya-cid manuṣyasya* (gen!) *dvau putrau āstān* (= dual 3rd impf. from the root *as-* 'to be'). He even gave a sample of the IE mother language, reconstructed according to the above Sanskrit, **monusos qwosyo-qwid dwō sūnū ēstōm*, or, according to the Greek original, **monus qwis e seghet dwō sūnū*: Luke 15,11: ἀνθρωπός τις εἶχεν δύο υἱούς, Vulg. *homo quidam habuit duos filios*, Wulf. *manne sums aihta* (!) *twans sununs*, Church Sl. *člověků eterů imě dŭva syna*, Arm. *aṙn mioǰ ein erku ordik* ("man's one's were two sons"), Fi. *eräällä miehellä oli kaksi poikaa*.

It seems somewhat difficult to understand what Meillet meant when saying "Le verb ἔχω est encore assez loin de fr. *avoir*", and quoting as a proof Luke 3,17: οὗ τὸ πτύον ἐν τῇ χειρὶ αὐτοῦ, which he translates 'qui a le van en main', though in

Greek the clause has no verb at all (Meillet 1923: 11). The Vulgate translates the Greek word by word *cuius ventilabrum in manu eius*, as also Ch. Sl. *jemuže lopatu vŭ rǫku jego*. To this Serbian translation added the verb 'to own': *on ima lopatu u ruci svojoj*. Wulfila added the participle: *habands winþiskauron in handau seinai*, Fi. added the verb 'to be' and the possessive suffixes: *hänellä on viskimensä kädessään*. Meillet stated in his paper that children are not "owned" by their parents, but the Gothic *aihta* and Ch. Sl. *imě* of this passage seem to show the opposite. How should we interpret cases like Matt 9,36: πρόβατα μὴ ἔχοντα ποιμένα, Vulg. *oves non habentes pastorem*, Wulf. *lamba ni habandona hairdeis* – do the sheep "own" their shepherd? Cf. Arm. *oroç oç içē hoviw*, Fi. *lampaat, joilla ei ole paimenta*. Since Gr. ἐχεῖν reveals its original meaning to have been 'to hold, to keep', and we have no proof of the existence of a verb **seghe-* 'to have' in the IE mother tongue, it seems rather risky to reconstruct such a verb on the basis of New Testament Greek.

The original meaning of ἔχω is shown in numerous places in the Iliad, for example 2,33: ἀλλὰ σὺ σῇσιν ἔχε φρεσί 'but do thou keep this in thy heart'; 6,509: ὑψοῦ δὲ κάρη ἔχει 'on high doth he hold his head'; 4,113: πρόσθεν δὲ σάκεα σχέθον ἐσθλοὶ ἑταιροῖ 'his goodly comrades held their shields before him'; 12,455: δοιοὶ δ'ἔντοσθεν ὀχῆεσ εἶχον ἐπημοιβοί 'two crossbars held them within'; 20,419: Πολύδωρον ἔντερα χερσὶν ἔχοντα '(beheld) Polydorus, clasping his bowels in his hands'; 16,763: Πάτροκλος δ'ἐτέρωθεν ἔχεν ποδός 'Patroclus over against him held fast hold in the foot'; further instances in Autenrieth-Kaegi, *Schulwörterbuch zu den Homerischen Gedichten* (Leipzig–Berlin, in many editions), p. 143.

In his work *Hittite et indo-européen* (1962), Émile Benveniste discussed the Hittite verb *hark-* 'to keep, to have', and the Latin *habeo*, showing quite convincingly, that in the earliest occurrences *hark-* has the meaning 'to keep the object in the state it has been put', e.g. *ešan hark-* 'to keep occupied' or *ištamanan lagan harmi* 'I keep my ears inclined'; in the oldest preserved text (Telipinus, ca. 17th century BC) KUR – *an udne tarhan harta* 'he kept subordinated the enemy country'. Again, when used with participles having a 'punctual' meaning, which cannot be prolonged, the construction comes to form a periphrastic perfect, e.g. *iyan harmi* 'I have done', so i.a. in the Prayers of Mursilis §5,5-6: *u̯astul tarnan harmi* 'the sin I have confessed'.

In the same way Latin *habere* not only at the beginning of the literary tradition but also later shows in many cases its original meaning to have been 'to hold, to keep', e.g. Varro, R. r. 1, 21: *pecus habere*, and *canes paucos habendum (est)*; Sallustius, Iugurtha 5: *milites modesto imperio habiti*; Florus 3,22,6: *certamina*; Celsus 3,18: *aegros in tenebris*. Livy said at the time of Hannibal 25,1,12: *(Aemilius praetor urbanus) edixit, ut quicumque libros vaticinos precationesve*

aut artem sacrificandi conscriptam haberet, eos libros omnis litterasque ad se ante kal. Apriles deferret 'proclaimed that every one holding~having prophetic books or prayers or writings on the art of sacrifice, should turn over all these books and scripts to him before the first of April'; 30,3,4: *classem paratam instructamque habebant* 'they kept the fleet prepared and arrayed'. The difference between the meanings 'to hold' and 'to have' is especially clear in cases in which they occur close to each other, as e.g. Plautus, Menaechmi 581: *qui... sollicitos patronos habent... qui aut fenore aut periuriis habent rem paratam* 'these (men)... keep their patrons worried... having amassed their property with usury or perjuries'; Menaechmi 587: *sicut me hodie nimis sollicitum cliens quidam habuit* 'that's the way a certain client of mine has kept me confoundedly worried today' (transl. by W. H. D. Rouse). In the opinion of Benveniste, however, in Latin we find only the first approximation of a periphrastic perfect, used only in very limited number of verbs.

Buck (1905) had already pointed out that, e.g., in the Umbrian Tab. Iguv. VII a 52 *pafe trif promom haburent* means 'the three (heifers) they at first take', and thus *habeo* = 'to take'. In Iran, too, the verb denoting 'to have' originates in a verb 'to hold, to keep'. Thus Darius says in Bisutun I 9: *vašnā ahuramazdāhah imah xsaθram dārayāmiy* (Bartholomae 1961: 691) 'by the will of Ahuramazda I keep~ have this kingdom'. In the Avesta, e.g. Yasna 31,7: *ya (xvaθrā) dārayat̰ vahištəm mano* 'with what (wisdom) he keeps the best thinking'. The same meaning is encountered also in Pahlavi, e.g. Ayātkār XIII 2: *awē kundāgīh hač aškamb i mādar dāst* 'that magic knowledge thou keepest(~kept) since the womb of thy mother'. From this derives the corresponding verb in Sogdian *δ'r-*, as well as the New Persian *dāstan* 'to have', used as an auxiliary, too. Regarding the Armenian verb *unim* 'I have', Meillet (1913) stated it to be without etymological relatives, WP I, p. 259 derives it from a root **eun- ~ *euen-*, and Pisani (1947, Nr. 128a) connects it as **op-ne-* with Hittite *ep-mi* 'I take', and Ch. Sl. *im-a-tŭ* (Nr. 46) with Latin *em-*, Lithuanian *im-* 'to take'. *kal-*, complementing *unel* in the aor., means according to Lidén (1906: 125-126) 'festnehmen', *jerb-a-kal* 'manucaptus, gefangen, Gefangener', *kal-an-k'* 'Gefangennehmen, Gefängnis'.[1]

Even though we admit the original meaning of these verbs to have been 'to keep, to hold', it seems unclear how we should interpret them in those cases in which the object is a sickness, either physical or mental. Such cases have been translated into Finnish with an "inner" case of the owner. So, e.g. Mark 3,30: πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον ἔχει, Vulg. *spiritum inmundum habet*, Wulf. *ahman unhrainjan habaiþ*, Fi. *hänessä on saastainen henki*. Mark 3,22: βεελζεβοὺλ

---

1   *unel* clearly shows its original meaning in Biblical quotations like Mark 12,12: ἐζήτουν αὐτὸν κρατῆσαι, Vulg. *quaerebant eum tenere*, Arm. *xndrein z-na* him) *unel* (inf. of the verb *unim*), Fi. *he olisivat tahtoneet ottaa hänet kiinni*.

ἔχει, Vulg. *Beelsebub habet*, Wulf. *Baiaizaibul habaiþ*, Fi. *hänessä on Beelse-bub.* John 7,20: δαιμόνιον ἔχεις, Vulg. *Daemonium habes*, Wulf. *unhulþon habais*, Fi. *sinussa on riivaaja* (cf. 8,48,49 and 52).

However, Luke 7,33 Church Sl. translated *běsŭ imatŭ* 'he owns a demon'. Acts 8,7: πολλοὶ γὰρ τῶν ἐχόντων πνεύματα ἀκάθαρτα, Vulg. *multi enim eorum qui habebant spiritus immundos*, Fi. *monista, joissa oli saastaisia henkiä.* Acts 16,16: παιδίσκην τινὰ ἔχουσαν πνεῦμα πύθωνα, Vulg. *puellam quendam habentem spiritum pythonem*, Fi. *eräs palvelijatar, jossa oli tietäjä-henki.* Luke 13,10: γυνὴ πνεῦμα ἔχουσα ἀσθενείας, Vulg. *mulier quae habebat spiritum infirmitatis*, Ch. Sl. *žena douxŭ imąšti nedąžĭnŭ*, Fi. *nainen, jossa oli ollut heikkouden henki.* In contemporary Finnish sicknesses are mostly treated like other things owned, e.g. *hänellä on sikotauti* 'he has mumps'.

There is in the Finnish Bible also one occurrence of the construction, in which the "owner" stands in the allative, which is the normal representative of the IE dative (for its suffix cf. Hakulinen 1968: 90): Luke 2,7: οὐκ ἦν αὐτοῖς τόπος ἐν τῷ καταλύματι, Vulg. *non erat eis locus in diversorio*, Wulf. *ni was im rumis in stada þamma*, OHG East-Franconian *Ni uuas ander stat in themo gasthuse*, St. Paul Gloss. (8th c.) *uuas imu stat in casthuse* (negation?), Fi. *heille ei ollut sijaa majatalossa*: in all the texts occurs one and the same construction with the verb 'to be'. Interesting is Wulfila's treatment of Greek ἐχεῖν. The preserved parts of his translation show that he has translated the verb now and then with *aigan* 'to own', etymologically connected with Sanskrit *īśe*, explained as a reduplicated perfect *i-iś-ai* 'he is master', e.g. John 6,40: ἔχῃ ζωὴν αἰώνιον, (Conj. Sg. 3) Vulg. *habeat* (Conj. Sg. 3) *vitam aeternam*, Wulf. *aigi* (Opt. Sg. 3) *libain aiweinon*, Fi. *jokai-sella on iankaikkinen elämä*; 10,16: ἄλλα πρόβατα ἔχω, Vulg. *alias oves habeo*, Wulf. *anþara lamba aih*, Fi. *minulla on myös muita lampaita*; 19,10: ἐξουσίαν ἔχω ἀπολῦσαί σε καὶ ἐξουσίαν ἔχω σταυρῶσαί σε, Ch. Sl. *jako vlastĭ imamĭ raspęti tę į vlastĭ imamĭ pustitĭ tę*, Vulg. *potestatem habeo dimittere te et potestatem habeo crucifigere te*, Wulf. *waldufni aih uskramijan þuk jah waldufni aih fraletan þuk*, Fi. *minulla on valta sinut päästää ja minulla on valta sinut ristiinnaulita*; 19,11: οὐκ εἶχες ἐξουσίαν κατ'ἐμοῦ ουδεμίαν, Ch. Sl. *ne imasi oblasti na mně*, Vulg. *non haberes potestatem adversum me ullam*, Wulf. *ni aihtedeis waldufnje ainhun ana mik*, Fi. *sinulla ei olisi mitään valtaa minuun*; Luke 3,8: πατέρα ἔχομεν τὸν Ἀβραάμ, Vulg. *patrem habemus A.*, Wulf. *attan aigum A.*, Fi. *onhan meillä isänä A.* 15,4: τίς ἄνθρωπος ἐξ ὑμῶν ἔχων ἐκατὸν πρόβατα, Vulg. *homo qui habet centum oves*, Wulf. *hvas manna izvara aigands tai huntehund lambe*, Fi. *jos jollakin teistä on sata lammasta*, (but Wulf. 15,8: *qino drakmans habandei taihun*). Luke 16,1: πλούσιος ὃς εἶχεν οἰκονόμον, Vulg. *dives qui habebat villicum*, Wulf. *gabeigs saei aihta fauragagjan*, Fi. *rikas mies, jolla oli huoneenhaltija.* Luke 17,7: τίς δὲ ἐξ ὑμῶν δοῦλον ἔχων ἀροτριῶντα, Vulg. *quis autem vestrum habens servum arantem*,

Wulf. *hvas izwara skalk aigands arjandan*, Fi. *jos jollakulla teistä on palvelija kyntämässä.* Luke 20,28: ἐάν τινος ἀδελφὸς ἀποθάνῃ ἔχων γυναῖκα, Vulg. *si frater alicuius mortuus fuerit habens uxorem*, Wulf. *jabai hvis broþar gadauþnai aigands qen*, Fi. *jos joltakin kuolee veli, jolla on vaimo.* Matt 8,20: αἱ ἀλώπεκες φωλεοὺς ἔχουσιν καὶ τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ κατασκηνώσεις, Vulg. *vulpes foveas habent et volucres coeli nidos*, Wulf. *fauhons grobos aigun jah fuglos himinis sittans*, Fi. *ketuilla on luolat ja taivaan linnuilla pesät.* Mark 12,23: οἱ γὰρ ἑπτὰ ἔσχον αὐτὴν γυναῖκα, Vulg. *septem enim habuerunt eam uxorem*, Wulf. *þai auk sibun aihtedun þo du qenai*, Fi. *hän oli ollut kaikkien seitsemän vaimona.* I Cor 7,12: εἴ τις ἀδελφὸς γυναῖκα ἔχει ἄπιστον, Vulg. *si quis frater uxorem habet infidelem*, Wulf. *jabai hvas broþar qen aigi ungalaubjandein*, Fi. *jos jollakin veljellä on vaimo, joka ei usko.* But in the Finnish translation, too, ἔχειν can mean i.a. 'to get, to receive', e.g. Rom 13,3: καὶ ἕξεις ἔπαινον ἐξ αὐτῆς, Vulg. *habebis tandem laudem*, Wulf. *ja habais hazein us þamma*, Fi. *ja sinä saat siitä kiitoksen.* II Cor 2,3: ἵνα μὴ ἐλθὼν λύπην σχῶ, Vulg. *ut non cum venero tristitiam habeam*, Wulf. *ei qimandans saurga ni habau*, Fi. *etten tullessani saisi murhetta.* Matt 5,46: τίνα μισθὸν ἔχετε, Vulg. *quam mercedem habebitis*, Wulf. *hve mizdono habaiþ*, Arm. *z-inč varjkʻ ičen* (= Lat. *sient?*), Fi. *mikä palkka siitä on tuleva* (why not '*minkä palkan siitä saatte?*') as in 6,1: μισθὸν οὐκ ἔχετε, Vulg. *mercedem non habebitis*, Wulf. *laun ni habaiþ*, Fi. *ette saa palkkaa.* It seems also to have been used with the meaning 'to hold mentally, to regard' (cf. German '*für etwas halten*'): Matt 14,5: ὡς προφήτην αὐτὸν εἶχον, Vulg. *quia sicut prophetam eum habebant*, Arm. *ibrew z-margare unēin z-na*, Ch. Sl. *za ne ěko proroka iměxa i.* Fi. *sillä he pitivät häntä profeettana.* Matt 21,46: εἰσ προφήτην αὐτὸν εἶχον, Vulg. *sicut prophetam eum habebant*, Fi. *koska se piti häntä profeettana.* Martialis (ca. 40-102 AD) says (II 79,2) *excusatum habeas me, rogo*, in the NT, Luke (14,18 and 19) ἐρωτῶ σε, ἔχε με παρῃτημένον, Vulg. *rogo te, habe me excusatum*, Wulf. *habai mik faurqitanana*, Fi. *pyydän sinua, pidä minut estettynä.* In a more concrete sense in Matt 14,4: οὐκ ἔξεστιν σοι ἔχειν αὐτήν, Vulg. *non licet tibi habere eam*, Arm. *č-ē aržan kʻez unel z-da*, Ch. Sl. *ne dostoitŭ ti iměti eję*, Fi. *sinun ei ole lupa pitää häntä*; cf. Hom. Il. 1,112: πολὺ βούλομαι αὐτὴν οἴκοι ἔχειν, 'I very much want to keep her in my home'. In certain expressions which are translated according to their sense, the verb can remain untranslated in Finnish, cf. e.g. Luke 19,34: ὁ Κύριος αὐτοῦ χρείαν ἔχει, Vulg. *Dominus eum necessarium habet*, Wulf. *fraujin þaurfts þis ist*, Fi. *Herra tarvitsee sitä*; Matt 14,16: οὐ χρείαν ἔχουσιν ἀπελθεῖν, Vulg. *non habent necesse ire*, Fi. *ei heidän tarvitse mennä pois!* In some phrases, for example, the infinitive must be translated with a finite form: Acts 24,16: συνείδησιν ἔχειν, Vulg. *conscientiam habere*, Fi. *että minulla (aina) olisi (loukkaamaton) omatunto.* The same must be done with the participle, e.g. Acts 24,15: ἐλπίδα ἔχων, Vulg. *spem habens*, Fi. *pidän sen toivon*; Luke 7,2: κακῶς

ἔχων, Vulg. *male habens*, Wulf. *siukands*, Fi. *sairasti* 'was sick'. Luke 14,14: ὅτι οὐκ ἔχουσιν ἀνταποδοῦναι σοι, Vulg. *non habent retribuere tibi*, Wulf. *unte eis ni haband usqildan þus*, Fi. *koska he eivät voi* (can) *maksaa sinulle*. Mark 5,23: τὸ θυγατριόν μου ἐσχάτως ἔχει, Vulg. *quia filia mea in extremis est*, Wulf. *dauhtar meina aftumist habaiþ*, Fi. *pieni tyttäreni on kuolemaisillaan*. Luke 11,36: μὴ ἔχον μέρος τι σκοτεινόν, Vulg. *non habens aliquem partem tenebrarum*, Fi. *eikä miltään osaltaan pimeä* (without any verb).

Very interesting seems II Cor 6,10: ὡς μηδὲν ἔχοντες καὶ πάντα κατέχοντες, Vulg. *tanquam nihil habentes et omnia possidentes*, Wulf. *swe niwaiht aihandans, jah alla disnimandans* (= *zer-nehmen* 'besitzen'), Fi. *mitään omistamatta, mutta kuitenkin omistamme kaiken* (better transl. 1992: *meillä ei ole mitään, mutta omistamme kaiken*).

Everywhere where there is a verb 'to have', it has been developed from a verb denoting 'to take, to keep, to hold (in hand)', e.g. in Lithuanian, *turiù* is a derivation of *tuer-* 'to grasp', and the Slavonic *iměti* is derived from the root *em-* 'to take' (Latin *emo* 'I buy').

In 1931, J. Kurylowicz discussed the periphrastic tempora of the Romanic languages, maintaining, i.a., that in Latin *mihi cantandum est* had the value of an active future. He did not pay any attention to the necessitative value of this construction, and to the fact that every expression of the necessity in fact refers to the future, like in Sanskrit (Rig Veda VIII 63,6) *kṛtāni kartvāni ca* 'the things done and the to-be-done'. In Latin the gerund~gerundive was replaced with the infinitive when a new necessitative periphrasis was formed with *habere*, and from this a new future was then derived. Kurylowicz used the study by H. Tillmann (1882), and on the basis of their work J. van Ginneken published a study "Avoir et être" (1939). In it he presented the theory that during the three first centuries of our era the passive *inimicus mihi occisus est* was prevalent, but after that time it was changed to *inimicum occisum habeo*. He refers to Tillmann, who, however, does not have any such instance, and does not discuss the verb *habeo*. *inimicum occisum habeo*, of course, replaces the old historical active perfect *inimicum occidi*. This is clearly expressed, e.g., in the Reichenau Gloss *mutuo acceperam "inpruntatum habebam"*. The so-called "Greek dative" is very rare in Latin, and in the Greek New Testament it seems to occur only once, viz. Luke 23,15: οὐδὲν ἄξιον θανάτου ἐστὶν πεπραγμένον αὐτῷ, Vulg. *nihil dignum morte actum est ei*, Arm. *oč inč mahu aržani ē gorceal dora* (gen.!), Fi. *hän ei ole tehnyt mitään, mikä ansaitsee kuoleman*.

In the Thesaurus Linguae Latinae (VI, pp. 2395ff.) the verb *habere* is defined 'to keep, to hold, to carry with, to own'. 'To keep' was properly *tenere* and it has preserved this meaning even in the Romanic languages. Early enough it also came to mean 'to have'.

The Roman historian Orosius, who was born in Tarragona in Spain, lived as a Christian priest in Portugal, then after 412 in North Africa with Augustine, and finally with Hieronymus in Palestine, and wrote Historiarum adversus paganos libri septem, which conclude with the year AD 410. E.g. in 3,1,1 of this work he says *Galli Roman captam incensamque tenuerunt*, which can only mean 'the Gauls conquered and burnt Rome'. Already the Roman poet Lucretius (ca. 97-55 BC) has some cases in which this meaning could be seen, e.g. II 1090 *quae cognita si teneas* can be interpreted "if thou hast come to well know these (truths)". In Spain *tenere* gained ground, and in the 16th century authors hesitated between the use of *ser* (Lat. **essere*) or *haber* or *tener* as the auxiliary of the intransitives. After Cervantes and Lope de Vega *haber* became established in these cases. On the other hand *tener* supplanted *haber* in the normal expression 'I have'. At present it is only possible to say *tengo hambre* 'I have hunger' (Fi. *minun on nälkä*). In the 13th century Gonzalo de Bercéo (1220-1246) in his poem "Alexandre" used *tener* as an auxiliary of the preterit, and since the 16th century this use has become general.

In Portuguese the development has gone further yet: since the 17th century *haver* has practically disappeared, and nowadays it is said *tenho amado* 'I have loved', and of the intransitives *tenho chegado* 'I have arrived', *haver* being used in some formulary expressions only. Latin *tenere* has in the oldest OHG translations been rendered with *haben*, e.g. Matt 26,50: τότε προσελθόντες ἐπέβαλον τὰς χεῖρας ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰησοῦν καὶ ἐκράτησαν αὐτόν, Vulg. *tunc accesserunt et manus iniecerunt in Jesum et tenuerunt eum*, Tatian (184,6) *legitun iro hant in then hailant ana inti habetun inan*, Fi. *silloin he tulivat Jeesuksen luo, kävivät häneen käsiksi ja ottivat hänet kiinni*. Matt 28,9: αἱ δὲ προσελθοῦσαι ἐκράτησαν αὐτοῦ τοὺς πόδας, Vulg. *illae autem accesserunt et tenuerunt pedes eius et adoraverunt eum*, Tatian (223,2) *sio giengun tho zuo inti habetun sine fuozi inti betotun*, Fi. *menivät hänen tykönsä, syleilivät hänen jalkojaan ja kumartaen rukoilivat häntä*. Mark 7,8: ἀφέντες τὴν ἐντολὴν τοῦ θεοῦ κρατεῖτε τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, Vulg. *relinquentes enim mandatum Dei tenetis traditionem hominum*, Wulf. *aflatandans raihtis anabusn guþs habaiþ þatei anafulhun mannans*. Tatian (83,7) *forlazzente uuarlicho gotes bibot habet manno gisaznissi*, Fi. *te hylkäätte Jumalan käskyn ja noudatatte ihmisten perinnäissääntöä*.

P. Meile in his paper "Infinitifs adjectivés en hindi" stated "c'est le tour *mihi est domus* qui parait être à l'origine de *mihi onerandus est*" (Meile 1948: 80). The gerundive in the latter can be replaced by an infinitive. Varro, R.r. 2,2,6: *diebus post paucis obicere iis viciam molitam* ~ 2,7: *obiciendum farinam molitam*, and with *habeo* + infinitive, Frontinus, Stratagemata 1,5,1: *cum flumen traicere haberet*. In Greek, e.g. Luke 12,50: βάπτισμα δὲ ἔχω βαπτισθῆναι, Vulg. *baptismo autem habeo baptizari*, Ch. Sl. *krĭšteniemĭ imamĭ kristĭti sę*, Fi. *minä olen kasteella kastettava*. In the Romance languages *habere ad* or *de* + infinitive then

expresses the necessity (Meyer-Lubke 1902: 347, etc.). Church Slavonic translates ἔχω by *imeti*. A periphrastic future with a tinge of necessity is also formed with the same verb: Matt 19,21: ἕξεις θησαυρὸν ἐν ουρανοῖς, Vulg. *habebis thesaurum in coelo*, Ch. Sl. *iměti imaši sŭkrovište na nebese*, Fi. *sinulla on oleva aarre taivaassa*. All three Slavonic versions, viz. Codex Zographensis, Codex Marianus, and Savvina Kniga, seem in general to agree in the use of *iměti*. Safarewiczowa (1964: 17) found out that the 19th century Synodal Edition uses the *u menja jest* construction in cases in which Codex Marianus and the Ostromir Gospel (ca. 1056-57 AD) use *iměti*. The Swiss scholar Franz Misteli in 1893 wanted to see in the Russian construction a proof of the influence of an "ural-altaisch" adstratum (Misteli 1893: 74). His hypothesis was supported by Veenker (1967: 117-119), and further by Valentin Kiparsky in his review of Veenker's book. In it he stated: "Sicher beruhen auf finnougrischen Modellen das Fehlen des Verbums 'haben' und der nord-russische Cokanje" (Kiparsky 1969: 27) (this shows he had never thought about the verb 'to have'), and still later Suhonen (1993: 161) also represented this opinion. Since, however, everywhere the verb 'to have', is rare and a recent development, I dare to wonder whether the Finnish and the Russian constructions can be regarded as related: in principle no proof *ex reticentia* can be considered valid. Misteli also mentioned the Russian verb *imat'*, *emlju* 'to take' (REW, I: 479, 398), which Vasmer, l.c., connects with Latin *emere* 'to take', and *voz-imeju* 'I seize' (REW, I: 198 *vzjat'*, *voz'mu* 'to take', from the prefix *vŭz-* and *jęti* 'to take'): he seems thus to want to explain the origin of the verb *imet'* in its meaning 'to have'. Misteli also quoted similar examples with a dative and the verb 'to be' in the meaning 'to have' from several languages, e.g. from the Dravidian Kannada.

In Greek the verb ἔχω with the participle perfect passive formed a substitute for the simple perfect and pluperfect active. According to Jannaris (1897, §239) this expedient made its appearance in Greco-Roman times and might thus have been furthered by the Latin construction with *habeo* + perfect participle pass. Finally, this usage resulted in the practice of forming compound tenses of the active voice, e.g. Plutarch (ca. AD 50 – ca. 125), Camillus 34,5: οὐδὲν ἄκος οὐδὲ σβεστήριον ἔχοντες οἱ Λατῖνοι παρεσκευασμένον 'the Latins had nothing at hand with which to ward off or quench (the fire)'. The connection with the participle aorist +ἔχω also came very close to a similar meaning: Hesiod, Op. 42: κρύψαντες γὰρ ἔχουσι θεοὶ βίον ἀνθρώποισι, 'the Gods keep men's nourishment concealed'.

In Latin it often seems difficult to distinguish with certainty between the cases in which *habeo* has its original meaning and those in which it already is used as an auxiliary of the perfect. As late as in the works of Grégoire de Tours (d. 794), this construction stands as the normal perfect: *episcopum invitatum habes* 'thou invited the bishop'.

Meillet, in his book *Caractères généraux des langues germaniques*, proposed, that *haben* as an auxiliary would be an imitation of the Latin *habere* (Meillet

1926: 130). Benveniste (1960: 132ff.) proved that the Germanic languages have developed their construction independently in parallelism with the Goth. *wisan*, OHG *wesan* (= *sein*) in passive. *Eigan* occurs in complementary distribution with *haben* in the indicative plural and in the optative. Though *haban* is met with in Gothic, it is not used there as an auxiliary of a periphrastic perfect. According to J. Dieninghoff (1904: 14ff.), these constructions were used only in the OHG and OLG literatures after the German translation of Isidor, in which *eigan* does not occur at all. In the 9th-century MS in St. Galle of Tatian *eigan* does not occur, nor in the scripts of Williram von Ebersberg (d. 1085). In the OHG translation of the Regula Sancti Benedicti II 75, *alii vero propria tenent loca* was rendered '*andre keuuisso eigono eigin steti*': there *eigan* occurs 5 times and *haben* only 3 times.[2] However, in the Casseler Exhortation (9th c.) already *intfangen eigut* translates *accepistis*. The periphrastic constructions then occur in Tatian and Otfrid in increasing numbers, in the texts of Notker (d. 1022) and Williram they then are met with "in überaus grosser Zahl".

In the 9th century the periphrases also appear in the OLG area: Heliand I 55: *habda them heriscipie herta gisterkid.*

In MHG their use had become quite normal, e.g. Walther von der Vogelweide (ca. 1165 – ca. 1243) and Hartmann von der Aue (ca. 1170 – ca. 1210) also use *haben* with imperfective intransitives (Gregorius 3307, by the latter): *wi er getobet hâte*. In any case, the periphrastic use of *haben* was already known when Anglo-Saxon split off from the other Germanic languages, since in it we meet cases like *nū ic haebbe gestrīened oþru twā pund* 'now I have gained two other pounds'.

In Old Norse the participle is normally a neuter, but in the earliest times it also could follow the gender of the object: *hann hafde sét hana* or *...hana séna* 'he had seen her' (Noreen 1892, §468).

4. *TO HAVE* IN FINNO-UGRIC LANGUAGES

Tamotsu Koizumi, when discussing those Uralic languages which have developed a verb 'to have', did not pay any attention to the lateness and the starting points of the development in question.

Erkki Itkonen explained the use of *âdnet* in the Lappish of Sweden to be a loan-translation according to Swedish. In his Lappische Chrestomathie (1960) occur some examples, e.g. *buollamii âdnik guolĕ-vuojâ* 'für Brandwunden gebraucht man Fischtran' (p. 72); 22,2: *son ālgii âdnet vaĭ'ven occât biebmo mĕcciin* 'he began to hold (= to regard) as pains the looking for food in the woods' (p. 24); 26:

---

2   J. Barat, in his paper "Les prétérito-présents en francique" said that: "Les textes les plus anciens traduisent regulièrement 'tenere' par *haben*, jamais par *eigun*" (Barat 1913-14: 135). But what about, e.g., this 8th-century OHG translation of the Regula Benedicti?

âdnik arvost du vanhemiidâd kultura ja gielâ? 'dost thou hold in esteem the culture and the language of thy parents?' (p. 35). In Itkonen's dictionary of Inari Lappish, we meet several instances, e.g. *ton siida ulmush onnii eep-imelijd* 'the people of that village held~had idols', *mun annam ajn rååmåt peydealu* 'I keep~ have always a Bible on (my) table', *tot oonij vähä heârån* 'he held (= regarded) himself as a little lord', *seämåågan peeivi haeaejajd ooniim* 'on the same day we held~had the wedding' (Itkonen 1986-91: 27). In the dictionary of Schlachter, there seems to be at least one instance: *De dàdnè mijen bååtsòi-viesòsna tjuov rähpè bieŋida adneet vàhkena* 'then, in this our reindeer breeding we must keep~have dogs as help' (Schlachter 1958: 171).

Lehtiranta (1992: 17) also gives instances with *âdnet*: *men tab jaamika taaktiev kalkah atniet aajmuon kaajhk-aajkiev* 'but that bone of the deceased thou must keep safe all the time'. Lagercrantz has an interesting example: *mun annem puori tälki* 'I had good weather' (Lagercrantz 1939, Nr. 83): this expression can hardly be connected with the 'keeping' or 'holding' or 'owning' by the subject 'I' of the clause.

In the Skoltlappisches Wörterbuch of T. I. Itkonen (1958), the verb *âdnet* has been registered without any examples.[3]

The Ob-Ugrian languages, viz. Vogul and Ostyak, also possess verbs with a similar function, obviously developed along the same lines as elsewhere, i.e. from the meaning 'to hold, to keep' to the idea of having. Artturi Kannisto (1919: 82) had already remarked upon the existence of those verbs. Ödön Beke (1937: 283-284) investigated the Vogul verb, proposing a connection with Votyak *voź-* 'to hold, to protect', and Ziryene *vid'źni-* 'to hold'. With these he compared Cheremiss *kutše-* 'to catch', which in his own Cheremiss material also occurs with the meaning 'to have, to own': *bakšəm kutše-m* 'I have a mill', *šuko məlandən kutše-m* 'I have much field', etc. Liselotte Schiefer, in her paper "*haben* im Wogulischen" (1973: 197-201), quotes instances like *luβ òńśi* 'he has a horse', *kīβr õńśèɣn* 'dost thou have a vessel?', *ɛk oậmp ɛnśìɣa* 'they have a dog', etc. Some instances in the Vogul dictionary by Munkácsi-Kálmán (1986) also point to the original meaning having been 'to keep': *pōrs wårén kīrt äśve* 'a pig is kept in the yard', but *såu sait åśwe* 'he has much reason'.[4]

The Ostyak dictionary by Karjalainen (1948, II: 969a) also quotes s.v. *taịda* 'to own, possess, keep, use, wear, keep in hand' such instances as *təu xuắx àr tắ·ịət* "he much money has", *màn ńåurēmət tăịɒåm* "I children have". In Paasonen's dictionary 2345 *màn xùṇ tăịtàm* 'I do not have any means' (Paasonen 1926:

---

4   With some reason one might ask whether the Vogul construction with the postposition *pāltɛ* is not coined on the model of the Russian *u menja jest,* as proposed by Riese (1990: 178), e.g. *tån pāltɛ nòmt môśśa* 'he has little reason'.

230). Lehtisalo in his Yurak-Samoyed dictionary gives to the verb *mɔzeťś* the meaning 'to have, to hold' (Lehtisalo 1956: 260), but his examples seem to be difficult to translate with these meanings.

Koizumi (1994: 240, 333) quotes from Ostyak-Samoyed or Selkup an example *qumịt soma poqqip ašša wẹrịsātit* "people good net not have".

Setälä, E. Itkonen and Hakulinen give an impression of being concerned because they regarded FU as the only group of languages not possessing a verb *habēre*. It seems, however, that most languages use devices similar to those in FU to express the very same relation: *minulla on ~ mihi est* might thus be regarded as a kind of "universal". The FU situation does further prove that Benveniste was right when stating:

> Du fait, *avoir* comme lexème est, dans le monde, une rareté; la plupart des langues ne le connaissent pas. Au sein même des langues indo-européennes c'est une acquisition tardive, qui mis longtemps à s'imposer et qui reste partielle.

He then ends with the statement:

> S'il y a une expression 'normale' de ce rapport, c'est *mihi est aliquid* tandis que *habeo aliquid* n'en est qu'une variante secondaire et d'extension limitée... (Benveniste 1960: 121).

On the other hand, the rare Uralic languages which have developed verbs 'to have' seem also have started from an original meaning 'to take, hold, keep'. Can such a development, too, be regarded as a kind of 'universal' in historical linguistics?

REFERENCES

AMMANN, H. 1961. *Nachgelassene Schriften zur vergleichenden und allgemeinen Sprachwissenschaft.* (Insbrucker Beiträge zur Kulturwissenschaft, Sonderheft 12.) Innsbruck.

BACOT, J. 1948. *Grammaire du tibétain littéraire*, II. Paris.

BARAT, J. 1913-14. Les prétérito-présents en francique. *Mémoires de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 18.

BARTHOLOMAE, Christian 1961. *Altiranisches Wörterbuch.* 2nd ed. Berlin.

BEKE, Ődön 1937. Worterklärungen. *Finnisch-ugrische Forschungen* 24.

BENVENISTE, Emile 1960. Être et avoir dans leur fonctions linguistiques. *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 55: 113-134.

------   1949. Sur l'emploi des cas en hittite. *Archiv Orientální* 17: 44-45.

------   1962. *Hittite et indo-européen.* (Bibliothèque archéologique et historique de l'Institut français d'archéologique d'Istanbul, 5) Paris.

BUCK, C. D. 1949. *A Dictionary of Selected Synonyms in the Principal Indo-European Languages.* Chicago.

------   1905. *Elementarbuch der oskisch-umbrischen Dialekte.* Heidelberg.

BURROW, T. & S. BHATTACHARYA 1970. *The Pengo Language*. Oxford.

CHATTERJI, S. K. 1963. *Languages and Literatures of Modern India*. Calcutta.

DIENINGHOFF, Joseph 1904. *Die Umschreibungen aktiver Vergangenheit mit dem Participium Praeteriti im Altdeutschen*. (Diss.) Bonn.

ECKMANN, János 1966. *Chagatay Manual*. (Indiana University Publications, Uralic and Altaic Series, 60.) Bloomington.

EDELMAN, D. I. 1975. Les verbes 'être' et 'avoir' dans les langues iraniennes. In: *Mélanges linguistiques offerts à Emile Benveniste*. (Collection Linguistique, 70.) Paris.

Ériu, The Journal of the School of Irish Learning, 1-. Dublin 1904-.

FOKOS-FUCHS, D. R. 1962. *Rolle der Syntax in der Frage nach Sprachverwandtschaft*. (Ural-Altaische Bibliothek, 11.) Wiesbaden.

GINNEKEN, J. van 1939. Avoir et être. In: *Mélanges de liguistique offerts à Charles Bally*. Genève.

Gser 'od: Suvarṇaprabhāsottama-sūtra. Tib. Übersetzungen, hrsg. von Johannes Nobel. Leiden 1944.

HAKULINEN, Lauri 1968. *Suomen kielen rakenne ja kehitys*. 3rd ed. Helsinki.

HOLTHAUSEN, F. 1934. *Gotisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Heidelberg.

------ 1949. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der englischen Sprache*. Göttingen.

ITKONEN, E. 1986-91. *Inarilappisches Wörterbuch*, I-IV. (Lexica Societatis Finno-Ugrica, 20.) Helsinki.

------ 1966. *Kieli ja sen tutkimus*. Helsinki.

------ 1960. *Lappische Chrestomathie*. (Hilfsmittel, 7.) Helsinki.

ITKONEN, T. I. 1958. *Wörterbuch des Kolta- und Kolalappischen*. (Lexica Societatis Finno-Ugricae, 15.) Helsinki.

JACOBI, Herrmann 1976. *Ausgewählte Erzählungen in Māhārāṣṭrī*. Darmstadt.

JANNARIS, A. N. 1897. *An Historical Greek Grammar Chiefly of the Attic Dialect*. London.

KANNISTO, A. 1919. *Zur Geschichte des Vokalismus der ersten Silbe im Wogulischen vom qualitativen Standpunkt*. (Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne, 66.) Helsinki.

KARJALAINEN, K. F. 1948. *Ostjakisches Wörterbuch*, I-II. (Lexica Societatis Finno-Ugricae, 10.) Helsinki.

KIPARSKY, V. 1969. *Gibt es ein finnougrische Substrat im Slavischen?* (Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae, Ser. B, 153.) Helsinki.

KOIZUMI, Tamotsu 1994. *Uralic Syntax*. Tokyo.

KURYLOWICZ, J., 1931. Les temps composés du roman. *Prace Filologiczne* 15: 448-453. Kraków.

LAGERCRANTZ, Eliel 1939. *Lappisches Wörterbuch mit grammatikalischer Einleitung*. (Lexica Societatis Finno-Ugricae, 6.) Helsinki.

LEHTIRANTA, J. 1992. *Arjeploginsaamen äänne- ja taivutusopin pääpiirteet*. (Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne, 212.) Helsinki.

LEHTISALO, T. 1956. *Juraksamojedisches Wörterbuch*. (Lexica Societatis Finno-Ugricae, 13.) Helsinki.

LIDÉN, Ewald 1906. *Armenische Studien*. (Göteborgs Högskolas Årsskrift, 12:2.) Göteborg.

LÖFSTEDT, Bengt 1963. Zum lateinischen possessiven Dativ. *Zeitschrift fur vergleichende Sprachwissenschaft* 78: 64-83.

MEILE, P. 1948. Infinitifs adjectivés en hindi. *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 44.

MEILLET, A. 1913. *Altarmenisches Elementarbuch*. Heidelberg.

------ 1923. Les développement du verbe 'avoir'. In: *ANTIΔΩPON. Festschrift Jacob Wackernagel zur Vollendung des 70. Lebensjahres gewidmet von Schülern, Freunden und Kollegen*. Göttingen.

MEILLET, A. 1926. *Caractères généraux des langues germaniques.* 3° éd. Paris.

MEYER-LÜBKE, W. 1902. *Grammatik der romanischen Sprachen*, III. Leipzig.

MISTELI, Franz 1893. *Charakteristik der hauptsächlichsten Typen des Sprachbaues.* Berlin.

MUNKÁCSI-KÁLMAN, Bernát 1986. *Wogulisches Wörterbuch.* Budapest.

NOREEN, A. 1892. *Altisländische und altnorwegische Grammatik* (= Altnordische Grammatik, I). Halle.

NYBERG, H. S. 1974. *A Manual of Pahlavi*, II. Wiesbaden.

PAASONEN, H. 1926. *Ostjakisches Wörterbuch.* (Lexica Societatis Finno-Ugricae, 2.) Helsinki.

PISANI, Vittore 1947. *Crestomazia indeuropea.* 2nd ed. Torino.

PISCHEL, R. 1965. *Comparative Grammar of the Prakrit Languages.* Transl. by S. Jha. Delhi.

REW = Max Vasmer, *Russisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, I-IV. Heidelberg 1950-58.

RIESE, T. 1990. Nochmals zu *habeo* im Wogulischen. *Specimina Sibirica* 3: 175-180. Pécs.

SAFAREWICZOWA, Halina 1964. *Obocznosc ja imeju i u menja est' w jezyku Rosyjskim dzis i dawniej* (Prace Komisji Jezykoznawstwa, 3.) Kraków.

SAMPSON, John 1926. *The Dialect of the Gypsies of Wales.* Oxford.

SCHIEFER, Liselotte 1973. *haben* im Wogulischen. *Finnisch-ugrische Forschungen* 40: 187-201.

SCHLACHTER, Wolfgang 1958. *Wörterbuch des Waldlappendialektes von Malå und Texte zur Ethnographie.* (Lexica Societatis Finno-Ugricae, 14.) Helsinki.

SETÄLÄ, E. N. 1926. *Suomen kielen lauseoppi.* 11th ed. Helsinki.

SKES = *Suomen kielen etymologinen sanakirja*, II. Helsinki 1958.

SSA = *Suomen sanojen alkuperä. Etymologinen sanakirja*, II. Helsinki 1995.

SUHONEN, Seppo 1993. Vepsäläis-venäläisiä lauserakenteita. In: Sirkka Saarinen & Jorma Luutonen (eds.), *Systeemi ja poikkeama. Juhlakirja Alho Alhoniemen 60-vuotispäiväksi 14.5.1993* (Publications of the Department of Finnish and General Linguistics of the University of Turku, 42): 158-174. Turku.

TILLMANN, H. 1882. De dativo verbis passsivis linguae latinae subiecto qui vocatur graecus. *Acta seminarii philologici Erlangensis* 2: 71-130.

VEENKER, Wolfgang 1967. *Die Frage des finnougrischen Substrate in der russischen Sprache.* Bloomington.

VENDRYES, J. 1937. Sur l'emploi de l'auxiliaire 'avoir'. *Mélanges de linguistique et de philologie offerts à J. van Ginneken.* Paris.

WALDE, Alois 1910. *Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch.* Heidelberg.

WP = A. Walde, *Vergleichendes Wörterbuch der indogermanischen Sprachen*, I-III. Hrsg. und bearb. von Julius Pokorny. Berlin–Leipzig 1930-32.